

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**Gabe Cherian**

201 Bluebell Road  
P O Box 1335  
Sun Valley, ID 83353 USA

**MAR 29 2006**

Phone: 1-208-622-7020

Fax: 1-208-622-4377 [Temporarily at Phone & Fax: 1-435-656-1149]

Email: gabe.cherian@cox.net

Number of Sheets including this First Sheet: 11 Sheets

FAXED ON MARCH 29, 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Gabe Cherian

Serial Number: 10/765,772

Examiner: HOA CAO NGUYEN

Filing Date: 01/26/2004

Art Unit: 2841

For: ORIENTED CONNECTIONS FOR LEADLESS AND LEADED PACKAGES.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

**TO THE OFFICE ACTION DATE MAILED 03/01/2006**

**Commissioner for Patents**

**P.O. Box 1450**

**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**>>> FAX #: 1-571-273-8300**

**MARCH 29, 2006**

**Reference: Your Office Action, date-mailed on 03/01/2006**

**Subject: Election of Claims to Prosecute**

Sir:

In full response to the referenced Office Action of 03/01/2006, I would like to respectfully elect, without traverse, the claims of **Group II** for prosecution in this application.

Your Office Action defines this Group II to include the original Claims 7-11.

**CHERIAN**  
ORIENTED CONNECTIONS FOR LEADLESS AND LEADED PACKAGES  
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

PATENT APPLICATION NO.: 10/765,772  
NON-FINAL

Page 2 of 11

I would like to thank Examiner Hoa Nguyen for the detailed analysis of the four Groups of claims and for showing how they differ from each other. This thorough analysis has helped me and guided me in the process of amending the claims and in my decision about electing which Group to prosecute.

Accordingly, I have amended the claims of both Group I and Group II, as seen below under "IN THE CLAIMS". In fact, I have cancelled all the claims of Group I as well as Group II, and replaced them by new claims, making sure that the new (replacement) claims fall in line with the remarks made by Examiner in the Office Action.

As a result, I suspect that the Examiner may find that the amended claims of Group I do now merge with the claims in Group II. In my layman's opinion, I believe that they now can be considered to be related to the amended claims in Group II. If Examiner finds that those amended claims of Group I can be included in Group II, and that they can be considered as part of one collective Group, then I would respectfully request that they be included and that they be prosecuted at the same time, as being part of Group II.

Once Examiner has the chance to review the amended claims, he may decide on a new grouping and may like to reconsider the way to divide the claims. I would be more than happy to comply with Examiner's decision at that time.

Please let me know if I can answer any questions.

Also, I understand that there are no additional fees required, because the number of outstanding claims at this time is similar to the original number of claims. Please advise me if this is not correct and if I do need to pay any additional fees.

Thank you and best regards.

Respectfully,

Gabe Cherian.